

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 12, 14 and 17-24 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 3-5 are amended, claims 19-24 are added, and claims 2 and 13 are canceled. The claims are amended to even more clearly distinguish over the applied references. Independent claims 1 and 4 are amended to delete the "indicator" feature added in the previous Amendment and to add the features previously recited in dependent claim 2. Claims 19-24 correspond to previously canceled claims 8-11, 15 and 16 in which the independent claims (previous claims 8 and 15 -- now claims 19 and 23) are amended to include the features of claim 2. Thus, no new matter is added by the above amendments.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 12, 14, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,721,001 (Berstis) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,507,363 (Anderson et al.), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,528,285 (Morikawa et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, the features previously recited in claim 2 have been incorporated into all independent claims of this application. Thus, the independent claims recite that a subfolder is automatically prepared within the predetermined folder prior the storage of the transmitted digital images, which are then stored in the subfolder. In rejecting claim 2, the Office Action referred to Fig. 1 and col. 6, lines 50-62 of Anderson et al. Applicant respectfully submits that Anderson et al. does not disclose or suggest automatically generating a subfolder within a folder as recited in the independent claims of this application. The portions of Anderson et al. cited in the Office Action do not disclose that subfolders are automatically prepared. Column 6, lines 55-62 of Anderson et al. merely indicate that each folder will include a plurality of subfolders" There is no indication that the subfolders are automatically prepared as recited in Applicant's independent claims. At col. 8, line 18 - col. 9, line 15, Anderson et al. discloses preparing folders automatically, but Anderson et al. explicitly teaches that its method


"eliminates the need for subfolders." See col. 7, lines 32-34 of Anderson et al. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Anderson et al. does not suggest modifying the system of Berstis as proposed in the Office Action. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of all independent and dependent claims is requested.

Claims 3, 5 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the references applied against claims 1 and 4, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,784,925 (Tomat et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to claims 3 and 5 (claim 13 has been canceled). Tomat et al. does not overcome the deficiencies noted above with respect to Berstis and Anderson et al. Accordingly, these claims are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to their corresponding independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

MAC/ccs

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: June 26, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
